

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending. By this Amendment, Claims 1-2, 6, 8, and 12-17 are amended. Applicants respectfully submit no new material is presented herein.

Allowed/Allowable Claims

Applicants respectfully acknowledge and appreciate the indication by the Examiner that Claims 8-11 and 13-21, although objected to for being dependent upon a rejected base claim, would be in condition for allowance if rewritten in independent form, including all of the features of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Objections

Claims 1-2, 8, 13, and 15-17 are objected to for minor informalities therein. Applicants have amended Claim 1-2, 8, 13, 15, and 17 responsive to the objection. As such, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

Regarding Claim 16, Applicants respectfully traverse the objection. Claim 16 depends from Claim 15, and Claim 15 recites a "cam angle." Therefore, "the cam angle" recited in Claim 16 has a proper antecedent basis. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

Claim 12 is objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c) as being in improper form, because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from another multiple-dependent claim (Claim 8). Applicants respectfully traverse the objection.

Claim 12 depends from Claims 1-7 and not Claim 8. Further, Claim 1 is independent, and Claims 2-7 are not multiple dependent claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 12 is not in improper form. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

Claims Rejected—35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Patent Abstract 2001-213383 by Sakagami et al. ("Sakagami"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 recites an electric assisted bicycle including, among other features, a clutch unit which can switch a lock direction in conjunction with a brake operation.

Sakagami discloses a power-assisted bicycle that transmits rotational power from a power assist motor M to a driving sprocket 13 through mating gears 83 and 76 and a first one-way clutch 75. The one-way clutch 75 is disposed between the gear 76 and a boss 74. In a driven condition, *i.e.*, when the motor M is driving the gear 76 in a first rotational direction, the one-way clutch 75 locks the boss 74 and the gear 76 together so that the boss 74 and the gear 76 rotate together. As a result, the gear 76 transmits torque to the boss 74. However, the one-way clutch 75 does not allow the boss 74 to transmit torque from the boss 74 to the gear 76, because the clutch 75 is a one-way clutch and cannot switch a lock direction. Therefore, once the motor M stops driving the gear 76, the one-way clutch 75 disengages, causing the gear 76 to idle even while the boss 74 continues to rotate in the first rotational direction. Hence, the boss 74 cannot transmit a torque to the gear 76.

Therefore, in order for the power-assisted bicycle of Sakagami to transmit a torque from the drive sprocket 13 to the motor M to generate a regenerative current, the power-assisted bicycle includes a cam 88, a shaft 89, a clutch plate 86, and a pressure plate 87. When braking, the cam 88 rotates about an axis of the shaft 89, which causes the pressure plate 87 and the clutch plate 86 to engage. Consequently, the clutch plate

86 deflects and engages both the boss 74 and the gear 83, so that the boss 74 and the gear 83 are locked together. As a result, the drive sprocket 13 transmits torque to the gear 83 through the pressure plate 87, the clutch plate 86, the boss 74, and the gear 76.

Therefore, the clutch 75 of Sakagami is a one-way clutch and, hence, cannot switch a lock direction in conjunction with a brake operation or otherwise.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. M.P.E.P. § 2131. For at least the reasons outlined above, Sakagami does not disclose each and every feature of Claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 should be deemed allowable.

Claims 2-7 depend directly or indirectly from Claim 1 and incorporate each and every feature recited therein. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2-7 are allowable for the same reasons Claim 1 is allowable, as well as for the additional subject matter recited therein. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the application, withdrawal of the outstanding objections and rejection, allowance of Claims 1-21, and the prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowability are respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, **referencing docket number 100725-00121.**

Respectfully submitted,
AREN'T FOX PLLC



Murat Ozgu
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,275

Customer No. 004372

1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036-5339
Telephone: (202) 857-6000

TECH/378003.1